

Title	<書評>W. Sundermann, Der Sermon vom Licht-Nous : eine Lehrschrift des östlichen Manichäismus, (BTT17), Berlin 1992
Author(s)	吉田, 豊
Citation	内陸アジア言語の研究. 9 p.105-p.111
Issue Date	1994-06
oaire:version	VoR
URL	https://hdl.handle.net/11094/19991
rights	
Note	

Osaka University Knowledge Archive : OUKA

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/>

Osaka University

Werner Sundermann, *Der Sermon vom Licht-Nous: eine Lehrschrift des östlichen Manichäismus; Edition der parthischen und soghdischen Version*, Berliner Turfantexte 17, Berlin, Akademie Verlag, 1992. 165 pp. + 40 plates.

Mnwhmyd rwšn wyfr's "the Sermon of the Light Nous" (hereafter Sermon) is a kind of summary of the Manichaean teachings for the clergy. In this text the New Man is contrasted with the Old Man, who has not professed Manichaeism and is under the control of passion, while creation of a man (microcosm) is compared with that of the macrocosm, the both processes being figuratively described in terms of days, nights, and their twelve hours. In enumerating and classifying virtues and vices in the Manichaean doctrine the Sermon uses tree-motifs, each virtue and vice being either a root, trunk, etc. of a 'limb' of a good and evil soul or a fruit of five cardinal virtues (or five gifts) and vices. This work is attested in the Parthian, Sogdian, Old Turkish, and Chinese languages and was obviously very popular among the Eastern Manichees.

So far only the Chinese (often called *Traité* according to É. Chavannes and P. Pelliot who first published it) and Old Turkish versions have been published. A part of the Iranian counterpart, which is no doubt closer to the original form, was identified by E. Waldschmidt and W. Lentz among the manuscript fragments of the German Turfan collection as far back as in 1926. In her catalogue of the Iranian manuscripts in Manichaean script published in 1960, M. Boyce collected all the Iranian fragments of the Sermon known to her (total 29 fragments), under the headings "Versions of the *Traité*" and "Texts similar to the *Traité*", of which the latter have no corresponding passages in the *Traité* but are very much similar to it. Since then no substantial progress was made until 1983, when the author of the book under review published a progress report of his edition. In the present state 46 fragments from 23 different mss. are identified as belonging to the Sermon, five in Sogdian and the others in Parthian. In the meantime fresh translation of the Chinese version was made public by H. Schmidt-Glintzer and that of the Old Turkish by H.-J. Klimkeit and Schmidt-Glintzer. Therefore, the time is ripe for the publication of the Iranian versions of the Sermon and the present book fulfills one of the most urgent desiderata of both Iranian and Manichaean studies. Sundermann deserves our greatest thanks for carrying out this difficult and painstaking work and for providing us with reliable text and translation of the Sermon in Middle Iranian, which the future study can safely rely upon. Most striking

is the great number of hitherto unattested words in the Parthian texts, which would have discouraged even competent scholars from undertaking the work.

The principal parts of the book are as follows: (a) long introduction comprising discussion of the contents of the Sermon and description of the mss.; (b) critical text of all the fragments with detailed comments on uncertain readings; (c) compiled text divided into 117 sections with translation on facing pages; (d) commentary on the translation discussing philological as well as Manichaeological problems; (e) edition of three Sogdian fragments related to the Sermon; (f) glossary consisting of two parts, one Parthian and one Sogdian; and (g) plates reproducing all the mss. published in the book with only one exception of Otani 1721 + 1722.

As a kind of supplement to the present book I should like to draw attention to the additional texts of the Sermon or texts related to it, which escaped Sundermann's attention.

Fragment II published by W. B. Henning (in: *Sogdica*, London, 1940, p.4) contains the Sogdian version of § 83 and one lost between §§ 82 and 83. The Parthian version enables one to correct some of Henning's readings and the revised text would read: [ZKn ptßyðy wnyh ZK ßr'y yrß'ky'kh xcy 'nwtδ'rky' (?) 'šy' (?)] (r)šty'kh nyxy'kh rty nwkr ['yn'k 's](t) [']z-w'ntch wnh ky ZY šw xw [pr z-'yh' (?)] 'z-[prt] xw(š)[ty' (?)] ZY wyxh ðyncrßst (misspelling for ðyncyxyßt ?) nrth rwxšny'kh šnxh [] rt šw ßr'y ZY wrkr ''y-kw-(n)[cyk' (?) 'z-w'nh] "The fruit of the tree of reason is wisdom, ... rectitude, and prudence. Then this is a living tree, which grows (?) on the pure land; its root (is) chastity, its trunk splendour, its branch ..., and its fruit and leaf (is) a eternal [life]". Since Fragment I (*Sogdica*, p. 2) ends with the first fruit of the tree of reason, one may be induced to suppose that it belongs to the same ms. as Fragment II and comprises the text preceding the latter.

The recto side of Otani 2075 may possibly be identified as the Sogdian version of §§ 86-90, while the other side refers to some of Mani's epistles and cannot belong to the Sermon. This situation suggests that the passage in question was cited in one of Mani's letters. If that is a case, the verso of Otani 1721 + 1722, i. e. § 117, may also describes the historical background against which this passage of the Sermon was quoted by Mani.

I should like to take this opportunity to edit Otani 2075 (7.3 cm X 9.0 cm), which is a fragment of a folio in Sogdian script. The inner margin being preserved, recto and verso can safely be fixed.

1 (.)[]
2 rt_nwk(r .)[]
3 xr'δk'n βr(w)[rt'k]
4 pyšnβ'nt [](...)[]
5 βrwrt'k oo kw mγ'w(n)[]
6 s'r pr'y-št'd't o[o]
7 t'δy-st'nw βrwrt'kw cy-nt[r w'nw]
8 (n)p'xšt δ'r tδβtyw ZY my (.)[]
9 ptnw'y MN 'tδrmnw δst' γrβt('?)[]
10 oo p'rZY 'M kyškyty 'M pt(ry)δt['kt]
11 t'r'kt''z-wnty RBkw[]

1 [(.)
2 []z-yšt'wc
3 []oo ZKn t'r'kw
4 ['šyh ZK] Br'k yp'kw xcy z-ym'
5 [](.)'rmy-' ZY nw-wrny oo ZKn
6 [t'r'k](w) m'nprn't'kw ZK Br'k r'yz
7 [](.)'k xcy oo βγtm'n'ykyh
8 [](.)'p(wšy)-cy-' ZY prðβn oo ZKn
9 [t'r'k 'šm'r'kh ZK Br'y stβtw(x ?)
10 [](.)[](p)tz-y twn(ty)-' 'mn ZY nmsy'(k)
11 [ZKn t'r'kw pt(β)[y]δy ZK Br'kw

“(verso) ... [The fruit of the (tree of) dark glory is] ... hatred ... The fruit of the (tree of) dark [memory] is anger, lie, ..., and lack of belief. The fruit of the (tree of) [dark] mind is ... desire, discord, ..., pillage (?) (obviously derived from pwš “cat”), and deceit (or destruction?). The fruit of the (tree of) dark thought is tyranny (?) (to be restored as

*stβtwxy'kh? “cruel-mindedness?”), dispute, violence, pride, and insult. The fruit of the (tree of) dark reason [is] ...”.

In the review of Boyce's catalogue I. Gershevitch mentions M 664 and states: “the r[ecto] side enumerates the ‘fruits’ of the ‘limbs’ of the soul ... ; beginning of the passage, here missing, which relates to the ‘limb’ šmāra is found in M 540 e r[ecto]”, cf. *BSOAS* 28, 1965, 159. From this description one may suspect that M 664 + 540 e may also contain the text of the Sermon, and in fact the text of the two fragments, which is known to me from the late Professor Dresden's notebook, comprises the Sogdian version of §§ 80-82. The most interesting feature of this ms. is that the text of the other side shows a clear similarity to §§ 94 and 95. M 664 belonged to the so-called Mainz Collection and that was apparently the reason why this ms. was not known to Sundermann. I, therefore, leave it for him to place this text in its proper perspective, a subject on which I am ill qualified to pronounce.

In what follows some alternative views are proposed mainly on the philological problems discussed in the commentary.

P. 78, 1.*2: It may worth referring to Aramaic and Parthian expressions of the Trinity restored from the Chinese transcription, i.e. 'b', br', rwh' hy' qdyš' (Aramaic) and pydr, pwhr, w'd jywndg 'wd wjydg (Parthian), cf. Yoshida, *BSOAS* 46, 1983, 326-31. In the light of these expressions one may be induced to emend the Chinese counterpart 淨法風 “pure-law-wind” into 淨活風 “pure-living-wind”. For the latter actually attested in the Hymnscroll see Lin Wushu, in: *Papers in honour of Prof. Dr. Ji Xianlin on the occasion of his 80th birthday (II)*, Peking, 1991, 880.

P. 80, 4.*2: For Henning's view against the identification of 未勞 wei lao with smyr see *Orientalia* V, mainly because the first character 未 wei (< Middle Chinese *mjvi) cannot stand for Iranian m- but for β- [v-], cf. Yoshida, in: *Studies on Inner Asian languages* II, 1986 [1987], 12. Since no Western Iranian word begins with β-, I venture to emend 未 into 末 mo (< Middle Chinese *muât), which could represent mad- or mar-, etc. However, no satisfactory reconstruction can be proposed.

P. 81, 6.*1: If one could restore a very short word like *rzwr before (c)y in manuscript a verso 7, šhrd'r rzwr cy hmg zmbwdyg would agree well with Chin. 斷事王 “le roi qui juge les affaires”.

P. 82, 7. 3 and 4: On the problem of the Chinese transcriptions of 'šqlwn and nmr'yl see Yoshida, art. cit. 13.

P. 84, 9. 3: For the Khotanese and Avestan cognates of pdyg “sinew” see P. O. Skjaervø, in: *Studies in the vocabulary of Khotanese*, II, Wien, 1987, 87-90.

Pp. 92-93, 21-23 (on the corresponding Old Turkish version): I venture to suspect that there is an error in the order of the five limbs of soul attested in TM 423 c (TM III, 18 ff): *qut*, *ög*, *köngül*, *saqinč*, and *tuymaq*. As Klimkeit and Schmidt-Glintzer propose (cf. *Zentralasiatische Studien* 17, 1984, 107), in T II D 119 (TM III, Nr. 8, i) the second limb is *köngül*; that it does not describe the third but the second limb is clear from the reference to *yil tngri*, who gets “belief” put on. When *ög* constitutes hendiadys, *köngül* or *saqinč* appears as the second member (cf. G. Clauson, *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth century*, Oxford, 1972, 99), and this may have been the reason why the original order **köngül ög* was changed to *ög köngül* in TM 423 c. The section about dark *ög* found in TM 300 mentions *s(ä)rinmäk* “patience”, which one is going to lose when the dark *ög* appears. Since patience is the cardinal virtue corresponding to the fourth limb *’ndyšyšn* (= *saqinč*), this *ög* may also have been an error for *saqinč* on the part of an inadvertent scribe, who was somehow influenced by the preceding section on dark *ög*. Accordingly, the fourth section begins in TM 300 recto 6 and ends in verso 5. That almost synonymous words describing mental processes also caused great difficulty for the Chinese scribe may lend support to my emendation of the Turkish text, cf. Chavannes and Pelliot, *JA*, 1911, 541-42, n. 6.

P. 94, 25. 4: On the meaning of a root **skaw-* possibly attested in a Sogdian verb *nyšk’w* “to take out” see also N. Sims-Williams, *Berliner Turfantexte* 12, Berlin, 1985, 178-79.

P. 97, 28. 2: In view of Parthian *drwg* one may be able to emend 忘 into 妄 *wang* “false”.

P. 98, 29. 3: In the ms. of the *Traité* a Chinese character 增 *zeng* meaning “to increase” is written as 憎 *zeng* “to hate”; this is clear from line 312 where 憎長 “hate-grow” stands for 增長 “increase-grow”. In the published texts this 憎長 is tacitly emended (cf. Chavannes and Pelliot, art. cit., 593 and *Taisho Issaikyo*, vol. 54, 1285c 15), apparently because the meaning is obvious from the context. **增上* “increase, superior” reminds one of Buddhist term 增上慢 “arrogance, pride”, which would suit the context perfectly well. In the light of the Chinese counterpart ‘*stwmnyft*’ could be compared with Middle Persian *stwmndly* “stronger” attested in the Psalter, cf. Skjaervø, *The Sassanian inscription of Paikuli*, Part 3. 2, Wiesbaden, 1983, 48.

P. 102, 34. 3: In my opinion 衆美 is not different from 衆美 *zhong mei* “much beauty” and describes the shining beauty in the appearance of electi. If my assumption is correct, *wysprxyft* would better be derived from *wyspryxt* in the meaning of “shone out (< sprouted)”, cf. the Khotanese cognate *guspr̥r̥is-* “to shine out”.

P. 104, 36. 3: Either “les règles imposantes” or “die strengen Vorschriften” is not a correct translation of 威儀, a Buddhist term denoting “respect-inspiring deportment, dignity” (cf. W. E. Soothill, *A dictionary of Chinese Buddhist terms*, reprint Taipei, 1976, 299), with which brhm nxšg agrees perfectly well.

P. 105, 36. 4: An ordinary Sinologist would render 真寔莊嚴諸行 as “truly ornamented deeds”, if he knew that it corresponds to dysm’n rzwr figuratively meaning “good deeds accumulated by electi”.

P. 108, 41a. 1: The Chinese expression corresponding to sxwn tnb’r, i.e. 說聽喚應聲, is to be translated as “the voice or word of Xruštag and Padwāxtag” not simply as “Xruštag and Padwāxtag”. Both Chavannes and Pelliot and Schmidt-Glintzer mistook 喚應聲 for the equivalent of 喚應, which alone stands for Padwāxtag. On this point see also *Kephalaia*, I. 92, 7-8 and 97, 4-5. It is to be noted in passing that myn’ndyy of M 14, verso 24 is rendered “(in der Welt) weilend” by Henning, cf. *BBB*, 125.

P. 109, 42b. 1: In discussing the meaning of ’st’nkw (or ’stn’kw) in this context one should refer to its antonym w’tyn’kt “spiritual” found in this section. Cf. also their Turkish counterparts közüñür “visible” and közüñmāz “invisible”. It is, therefore, likely that this is an adjective with the range of meaning “concrete-solid-lasting-permanent”. That the Sogdian translator understood 本 as denoting “fundamental” in the sense of “unchanging and everlasting” seems to have been the reason why Buddhistic Chinese 本願 “original vow” is rendered as ’stny ’γδ’k.

P. 115, 66. 1: ’c b’s’h, etc. could be a partitive object depending on fr’mwšyd “forget”. On the partitive use of the preposition ’c in Parthian see Ch. Brunner, *A syntax of Western Middle Iranian*, New York, 1977, 145.

P. 115, 66. 2: Since the Turkish expression yuk tävirmäk which translates Parthian ’mwg prwštn literally means “to turn a teaching”, one would be tempted to derive prwštn from the present stem prwrđ- “to turn”, on which see Sims-Williams, in: *Études irano-aryennes offertes à G. Lazard*, Paris, 1989, 325. For the past stem compare its cognates ’mwrđ-/’mwšt- and ’zwrt-/’zwšt-. This assumption may find support in the Sogdian combination ywk prwryt’m’nty, cf. Sundermann *apud* P. Zieme, *Berliner Turfantexte* 5, 1975, 69 and Yoshida, in: *Studies on the Inner Asian languages* V, 1989 [1990], 103-4.

P. 115, 70. 1: That wdysg’r denotes “indisive” rather than “suspicious” is not only confirmed by the Chinese counterpart of wdysg’ryft found in §28 but also by the Turkish rendering ornays(i)z ikirēgü “lit. unstable (and) undecided”, cf. Clauson, *op. cit.*, 237. What Klimkeit and Schmidt-Glintzer state in note 86 escapes me.

P. 116-17, 79. *1: In the light of the Turkish version (köngülin) ... bamaz ulamaz

“does not bind (his mind)” one may restore [ny] pdbndy(d) and translates pdbnd- as “to bind”, which is the alternative rendering proposed by Sundermann.

P. 124, 100. 5: Cf. also Inscriptional Middle Persian 'wzm'n and Parthian 'wzmn, on which see Skjaervø, *op. cit.*, 55, 159.

P. 129, ak line 64: M 664 mentioned above suggests restoring ['yw 'rδ](wk)y' “sincerity”.

Pp. 131-32, ak 3: On the Sogdian list of the five members a soul see also *BBB* 624sq., where the second member is not jn' but šy'. This is the opportunity to draw attention to the so far unnoticed correspondence between two passages of the *Traité* describing mercy, which is the first cardinal virtue, and those attested in *BBB* 629sq. One is 'fṭmw fryt'ṭ kyy wnyy s'ṭ šyry'kty'y prwyjnny xcy “in the first place love, which is a nourisher of all the good deeds” corresponding to “la pitié est l'ancêtre de toutes les actions méritoires” (Chavannes and Pelliot, *art. cit.*, 563, 18-19) and the other (c'nw frm'yṭ) kw pryḥ qmb wysp kyrdg'n ny 'spwr “(as He teaches:) where there is little love, all the deeds are incomplete” being translated as “si on n'a pas la pitié, aucune action méritoire ne saurait réussir” (Chavannes and Pelliot, *art. cit.*, 564, 8-9).

Unfortunately misprints and lapses calami are not few, which is understandable in the case of the present work where so many Chinese characters and letters with diacritics are printed. Among the more serious one may mention the following. Read ''j(b)jyyd for ''j(b)j'r (p. 49, k/r/6/); 'bn'syyd for 'bn'sd (p. 50, m/v/19/); [.](z)dwdn for (z)dwdn (p. 50, o/r/4/); [dwy]sd for [dw]sd (p. 57, af/r/18/); 'yšt'h for 'št'h (p. 58, aj/v/4/); ['tr RBk'] for ['tr RBK'] (p. 61, ba+b/r/2/); d'ryd for d'rynd (p. 70, § 49); 喝更 for 喝更 (p. 81, 6.*1); 衆生 chung sheng for 生 (p. 88, 14. 2); 電那勿 stands for nothing other than dyn'br (p. 90, 18.*1), on which see also Yoshida, in: *Studies on Inner Asian languages II*, 1986 [1987], 7; read 入 for 八 (*ibid.*); hawīn for harwīn (p. 96, 26.6); 諂 for 諂 (p. 97, 28. 3); 誑 for 誑 (p. 98, 29. 2); 歡喜 for 快樂 (p. 102, 34. 2); 淨 for 浮 (p. 105, 36. 6); mhyg'r 'nd'gyn may correspond to 所損惱 “blessée et tourmentée” (p. 116, 74. 1); read 'st'r'k (aka-stem) for 'st'r (p. 155); 𐰽ry (aka-stem) for 𐰽r- (p. 156); fr'myc for frm'yc and f'rmyc for fr'myc (p. 157), cf. Sims-Williams, *op. cit.*, 122; 𐰽wwš should constitute a separate lemma (p. 157); wy'ḅrtyy is not a plural form but a past participle of wy'ḅr “to speak” employed as a noun, cf. *GMS* § 964 (p. 159); xwpy' is to be rendered as “skill” (p. 160); recto and verso of the manuscript t are misplaced (plate XV).

Y. Yoshida